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Late papers circulated prior to the meeting in respect of items to be considered and determined.
PLANNING COMMITTEE

LATE PAPERS

Thursday 23rd January 2020
AGENDA ITEM 8– APPLICATION 19/00444/FUL

Mayfield, 282 Malvern Road

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a detached block of 6no. 2-bed flats and 3no. detached bungalows with associated open space, car parking and road infrastructure.
Members of Worcester City Council Planning Committee

c/o Mr Alan Coleman
(by e-mail)

Date: 17/01/20

Dear Alan,

RE: 282 Malvern Road, Worcester

I would be grateful if you would circulate this letter to all members of planning committee prior to the next meeting, where the above proposals will be considered for a second time on 23 January 2020.

My clients are extremely disappointed that members have chosen to be ‘minded to refuse’ this application, against the officer’s recommendation. Should a refusal be issued following the second committee meeting, our advice to Lockley will be to appeal this scheme and seek a full award of costs, in light of the current, draft refusal reasons being put forward.

We fully appreciate that members prerogative is such that they have the ability to go against an officer recommendation, and this is clearly explained in the officer’s second report at para 4.1.

However, we have considered the wording of the draft refusal reasons and strongly believe the Council would have acted unreasonably: having gone against the advice of the Council’s professional officers without good reason and failing to substantiate such objections on the grounds of harm to living conditions or character and appearance (so far, as indicated the two main issues). We consider that the Council would have failed to provide an accurate evaluation of the predominant character of the area and relied on baseless assertions, disregarding the evidence we have submitted with the application. It is our
view that the proposal complies with the relevant parts of the development plan, as well as other relevant material considerations and it should be permitted.

Neither of the 'main issues' are particularly subjective matters that could easily be taken in alternative ways and should we be required to appeal, this will cause Lockley Homes delay and unnecessary expense. This constitutes unreasonable behaviour.

Should the Council be happy to continue along this trajectory, then would urge members to be mindful of their responsibility to taxpayers at a time when public money is scarce and officer time is extremely limited.

We would therefore respectfully urge members to consider their position in relation to these proposals in light of the second officer's report – which makes their professional opinion extremely clear on not only the likely outcome at appeal, but also the potential for a costs award.

We consider members should also seriously consider what evidence they would be putting forward in the event of an appeal being lodged, in light of the extensive work that has already been done by both the applicants and the officers.

Lockley Homes has worked hard to design a scheme that reflects the advice received, from the Council's pre-application advice, from the pre-application consultations with the residents of neighbouring properties, and from the Council's case officer. Further to this, Lockley Homes agreed an extension of time for the determination of the application to allow further scrutiny by the Planning Committee. Throughout the entire process they have been pro-active, respectful and collaborative, and are satisfied that the proposals now before the Council are well designed and warrant approval.

It is Lockley Homes intention to make a start on site as soon as is practically possible, and contribute towards the city's provision of housing.

Thank you for your careful consideration at this time.

Yours Sincerely,

Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

Director
Dear Mr Blundell,

Thank you for sending notification of the Planning meeting on 23rd January, 2020 with agenda and report of 19th December 2019, relating to the above application.

I should like to reiterate the comments/objections I made with regard to this application in my consultation response dated 20th October, 2019.

For the record I would add that the statement in your report is incorrect. Where your report states that I have no objections, that is not correct with regard to the current application and should not be included in the report. This paragraph referred to a previous proposed layout from Mr Lockley and was in response to your consultation dated 9th July, 2019.

Please can you remove this paragraph from your report.

Yours sincerely,

Andrea Watkins,
14 Sherwood Lane.

Sent from my iPad

Reference: Planning application 19/00444/FUL at Mayfield 282 Malvern Road Worcester WR2 4PA. Please see the attached document for more information. Any further comments will be passed to the relevant planning officer.

******************************************************************************
*******
Worcester City Council - delivering excellent services for Worcester
AGENDA ITEM 13 – APPLICATION 19/00836/FUL

Former Ice works, 174 Bromyard Road

Amendments and alterations to design of residential scheme for 54 no. apartments approved under P15C0371 to reduce overall scale of development
PLANNING COMMITTEE – 23rd January 2020

Late Paper Report - Agenda Item 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>19/00836/FUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Former Ice Works, 174 Bromyard Road, Worcester, WR2 5EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Development</td>
<td>Amendments and alterations to design of residential scheme for 54 no. apartments approved under P15C0371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Officer</td>
<td>Mike Nicholls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Iceworks Developments Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Member(s)</td>
<td>Bedwardine Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Tom Locke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Condition

A further consultation response has been received from the Highway Authority that is attached to this report requesting the provision of an additional parking space to serve the additional bedroom proposed in the previously approved one bed unit as follows:

‘The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until an additional parking space has been provided to comply with the Council’s adopted highway design guide has been provided in accordance with details which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To comply with the Council’s parking standards.’

The recommended conditions regarding cycle parking, residential welcome pack and access, turning and parking are already included in the plans list in paragraph 9 of the report to the Planning Committee.
22nd January 2020
Your ref: 19/00836
Ask for: Karen Hanchett

Dear Mr Nicholls

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
(DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) (ENGLAND) ORDER 2015
ARTICLE 18 CONSULTATION WITH HIGHWAY AUTHORITY

PROPOSAL: Amendments and alterations to design of residential scheme for 54 no. apartments approved under P16C0371 to reduce overall scale of development

LOCATION: Former Ice Works 174 Bromyard Road Worcester

APPLICANT: Iceworks Developments Ltd

Further to the previous response from the Highway Authority dated 11th November 2019 we have undertaken a further review of the application and require an additional parking space to be provided.

The current proposal provides 1 allocated parking space per unit which complies with the parking standards in place at the time the application was approved. This current application seeks to increase the number of bedrooms on 1 of the units from 1 to 2 bedrooms and under our current adopted parking standards this requires 2 spaces.

Conditions

Car Parking

The Development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until an additional parking space has been provided to comply with the Council’s adopted highway design guide has been provided in accordance with details which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Tel: 01905 843466 • Email: khanchett@worcestershire.gov.uk • DX 29941 Worcester 2
www.worcestershire.gov.uk

Please recycle this item after use
REASON: To comply with the Council's parking standards.

Cycle parking

The Development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until sheltered, secure and accessible cycle parking to comply with the Council's adopted highway design guide has been provided in accordance with details which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the approved cycle parking shall be kept available for the parking of bicycles only.

REASON: To comply with the Council's parking standards.

Residential Welcome Pack

The Development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the applicant has submitted to and had approval in writing from the Local Planning Authority a residential welcome pack promoting sustainable forms of access to the development. The pack shall be provided to each resident at the point of occupation.

REASON: To reduce vehicle movements and promote sustainable access.

Access, turning and parking

The Development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the access, turning area and parking facilities shown on Drawing PL003 has been provided. These areas shall thereafter be retained and kept available for their respective approved uses at all times.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway.

Informatives

Alteration of highway to provide new or amended vehicle crossover

This permission does not authorise the applicant to carry out works within the publicly maintained highway since such works can only be carried out by the County Council's Approved Contractor, Ringway Infrastructure Service who can be contacted by email worcestershirevehicle.crossing@ringway.co.uk. The
applicant is solely responsible for all costs associated with construction of the access.

Yours Sincerely

KAREN HANCHETT
Transport Planning and Development Management Team Leader
AGENDA ITEM 14 – APPLICATION 19/00736/FUL

87 Windsor Avenue

Change of use from 3 bedroom house (C3) to 4 bedroom HMO (C4).
Application Number | 19/00736/FUL
---|---
Site Address | 87 Windsor Avenue, Worcester, WR2 5NB
Description of Development | Change of use from 3 bedroom house (C3) to 4 bedroom HMO (C4).
Case Officer | Mrs Sally Watts
Applicant | Big Fish Properties Ltd
Ward Member(s) | St. John Ward
Agent | Big Fish Properties Ltd
Reason for Referral to Committee | Ward Member referral
Expiry Date | 25 November 2019

Condition 4 relating to the management plan have been revised. The wording highlighted has been inserted for clarity and to ensure this is provided in the longer term.

4. Full details of a management plan for the use of the property hereby approved shall be submitted in writing and agreed by the local planning authority. This will include details of the management of the following:-

- Resolution of complaints from neighbouring residents;
- Control of noise levels;
- Control of anti-social behaviour
- Details of the management of refuse on the site including measures in place ensuring they are returned to the rear amenity space.

The details are to be agreed prior to occupation.

The use of the property as a HMO shall be carried out in accordance with these details.

For the following reason:-

To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residents in accordance with policy SWDP 21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework in this regard.
Any Other Business
## Site Visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>App No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>19/00634/HP</td>
<td>110 Medway Road</td>
<td>To enable full and proper consideration of the proposal in relation to the character and setting of the site and supporting area, relationship to neighbouring properties, land uses and appreciation in context with the under setting of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM 17 – APPLICATION 19/00634/HP

110 Medway Road

Proposed erection of a two storey rear extension and single storey side extension
PLANNING COMMITTEE – 23rd January 2020

Late Paper Report - Agenda Item 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>19/00634/HP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>110 Medway Road, Worcester, WR5 1LN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Development</td>
<td>Two storey rear extension and single storey side extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Officer</td>
<td>Laura Williamson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Sarfraz Tabusson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Member(s)</td>
<td>Nunnery Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Rachel Mason</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Neighbour Comments

Following publication of the agenda, further comments have been received from neighbouring residents that are attached to this report.

In response to the points raised by the neighbouring resident at 24 Helford Close I would comment as follows:

1. Extension of neighbour consultation period

I have advised the neighbouring resident that the reference in paragraph 1.1 of my report refers to the agreed extension of time for the determination of the application. Neighbours were consulted on the amended plans and the consultation period for comments on the amended plans on 14th January 2020 for a period of 7 days that expired on 21st January 2020;

2. Certification

Ownership Certificate ‘A’ was submitted with the application that certifies that nobody other than the applicant was the owner of any part of land or building to which the application relates. For these purposes, an owner is defined as ‘a person with a freehold interest or leasehold interest with at least 7 years left to run on any part of the land or building to which the application relates.’ In this respect, ownership certificates do not need to be verified by neighbours. However, any boundary disputes are a private legal matter between the parties concerned, the outcome of which may prevent have implications on the ability to implement any planning permission that may be granted;

3. Guttering

The comments are noted. However, there are various technical options available including the use of integral or ‘hidden’ parapet guttering systems that would not overhang the boundary, such as that illustrated below:
In response to the points raised by the neighbouring resident at 108 Medway Road my report refers at paragraphs 7.7 to 7.9 to the 45 and 25 degree code tests as set out in the adopted South Worcestershire Design SPD. Whilst there may be other 'right to light rules', nevertheless for planning purposes the 45 and 25 degree code tests set out in the adopted South Worcestershire Design SPD are those that are used by the Local Planning Authority to assess the impact of proposals on neighbouring residents.
**Comment for planning application 19/00634/HP**

**Application Number**: 19/00634/HP  
**Location**: 110 Medway Road Worcester WR5 1LN  
**Proposal**: Proposed erection of a two storey rear extension and single storey side extension.  
**Case Officer**: Laura Williamson

| Organisation Name | Kathryn Bishop  
| Address | 24 Helford Close, WORCESTER, WR5 1NB  
| Type of Comment | Objection  
| Type | neighbour

**Comments**

FIRSTLY CAN I CHECK THAT THESE OBJECTIONS WILL BE REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING AS THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA STATES THAT THIS CONSULTATION HAS BEEN EXTENDED UNTIL 30.01.20 (Agenda point 1.1) Agenda point 17.17 Accuracy of the plans, This is news to the residents who boundary 110 Medway Road. 'Plans have been submitted which have been certified to be accurate by way of certificate on the application form' 1. Certified by who? 2. Accurate according to whom? The applicant nor his agent has been in touch, no measurements have been taken, how can we contest something we haven't seen. No mention has been made of this until the committee agenda has been published. NO. MEASUREMENTS HAVE BEEN AMENDED FROM FIRST TO LAST PLAN SUBMITTED We dispute in the most strongest of terms possible that the plans are in any way accurate and the boundary as per all plans submitted under this application including all revised plans are incorrect and have not been agreed by neighbours at 23 and 24 Helford Close. I know boundary disputes are not a matter for the planning committee but all information in point 17.17 is incorrect and should not be relied upon. 7.19 Gutting I note the inclusion of point 5 in section 9 Recommended conditions - but I ask that no planning permission is granted until plans are seen and approved for guttering/waste water as after extensive research I can see no internal ways of installing guttering to a sloped roof like this that will not over hang the (disputed boundary) and fear that it will go ahead without the inclusion of any rain water redirection and my garden will become a sodden and my fences rot.

**Received Date**: 21/01/2020 21:51:30  
**Attachments**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>19/00634/HP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>110 Medway Road Worcester WR5 1LN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Proposed erection of a two storey rear extension and single storey side extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Officer</td>
<td>Laura Williamson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Name</td>
<td>andrew mcghee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>110 Medway Road, WORCESTER, WR5 1LN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Comment</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>neighbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>having reviewed the 45 degree right to light I strongly object to the measurement of 1.5 metres rear extension on the upper storey. The right to light rules I have read say that this must be no further than the the middle of my first window. By my measurements the longest allowed for the proposed extension should only be allowed at approx. 980mm. Could this be clarified asap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Date</td>
<td>17/01/2020 19:24:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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